

Appendix 5

Consistency with County General Plans

<p align="center">Garfield County General Plan <i>Adopted 13 March 1995</i> <i>Amended 26 January 1998 (To incorporate the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument Proclamation)</i></p>	
<p>CHAPTER 6, PUBLIC LANDS MANAGEMENT <i>Planning Assumption #1</i> “Historically the livestock, timber and agriculture industries within the county have shaped county custom and culture and made significant contributions to the economic base. These industries continue to play a vital role in the county’s lifestyle and economic stability.... <i>Therefore</i>, the county deems it critical that: resource management plans provide for range improvements, current grazing on public lands be preserved, county water rights be maintained...”</p>	<p>DRAFT MMP AMENDMENT/DRAFT EIS Consistent – The “management preferred” alternative specifically provides for the continuation of the livestock industry. To “keep lands suitable for grazing open and productive” was a major planning goal. The draft MMP amendment recognizes the role of the state in managing water rights, and proposes no changes in water rights. Range improvements are proposed under all action alternatives.</p>
<p><i>Planning Assumption #2</i> “County wildlife resources are important elements of county’s custom and culture... Therefore, the county desires that wildlife resources be comprehensively managed without detriment to county economic interests.”</p>	<p>Consistent – No changes in wildlife management are proposed. The draft MMP amendment fully supports Utah Division of Wildlife Resources wildlife management goals, and all action alternatives improve wildlife habitat.</p>
<p><i>Planning Assumption #3</i> “Over 96 percent of the land within the county is federal or state land. County industries such as agriculture, grazing... depend on these lands and their accompanying resources for economic stability. Therefore, it is in the county’s best interest that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM/USFS land management practices encourage economic ecological stability.” 	<p>Consistent – The draft MMP amendment would bring the GSENM into compliance with the Standards for Rangeland Health, which address the ecological stability of rangeland resources (soils, riparian and biotic), while providing for the economic stability of the livestock industry. Changes which impact livestock economics are only proposed when monitoring indicates a loss of ecological function, with the proposed action being designed to restore full functionality.</p>
<p><i>Policy Statement #7</i> “Garfield County takes the position that the number of Animal Unit Months (AUMs) allocated within the county should be expanded to the full carrying capacity of the forage resource.”</p>	<p>Consistent – The alternatives within the EIS are based upon extensive monitoring. Proposed reductions in stocking are tied to monitoring data, and are proposed to protect the forage resource, along with providing restoration of that resource.</p>
<p><i>Policy Statement (Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument) #2</i> “Garfield County endorses management of the monument by the Bureau of Land Management, pursuant to applicable legal authorities, as specific in the proclamation so long as BLM continues to</p>	<p>Consistent – All alternatives are proposed consistent with the legal authorities of the BLM. Monitoring and data interpretation were completed consistent with existing BLM Technical References,</p>

follow established procedures and to use balanced multiple use management as the basis of managing the monument.”	and Standard Operating Procedures.
<i>Policy Statement (Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument) #2</i> “Current policy is that the lands in the monument must remain open for multiple use activities including... grazing, etc.” “The County holds that it is critical that all uses be dealt within the management plan.”	Consistent – Grazing will be continued under all alternatives.
<i>Policy Statement (Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument) #10</i> “Garfield County holds that the three year planning process for the monument must involve, in a meaningful way, both the State of Utah and the two counties in which the monument is located.”	Consistent – Garfield and Kane Counties, along with the State of Utah were members of the interdisciplinary team for this draft EIS.
<i>Policy Statement (Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument) #12</i> “The County endorses the position that nothing in the proclamation shall be deemed to affect permits or leases for, or levels of livestock grazing on Federal lands within the monument. Existing grazing uses should continue to be governed by applicable laws and regulations other than the proclamation, as specified in that document.” “... it will be essential... that provisions be included in the NMMP which designate livestock grazing and related activities as essential parts of those historic values to be protected by the designation of the monument. The County’s position is that there should be no net loss of AUMs due to designation of the monument.”	Consistent – No changes in livestock management are proposed based upon either the Proclamation or the Monument status of lands within the planning area. All proposed changes are based upon the BLM grazing regulations at 43 CFR 4100, and the other existing authorities under which the BLM operates. All proposed AUM reductions are based upon a failure to achieve Rangeland Health Standards (43 CFR 4180), and proposed actions are consistent with BLM’s livestock management on non-NLCS lands.
Kane, Garfield County, and Gateway Communities Joint Grazing and Forage Principles Resolution	
“Be It Further Resolved that livestock grazing be continued and based on the existing preference levels, unless prudent management practices dictate otherwise.”	Consistent – Livestock grazing will continue unchanged, except where monitoring indicated negative impacts to the range resource.
“Be it Further Resolved that any changes to management of grazing allotments on the Monument be based on peer reviewed scientific management practices and that day to day management be based on joint determination by the permittee and appropriate BLM Resource Area personnel.”	Consistent – All monitoring, data interpretation, and proposed management changes are consistent with BLM Technical References, which have been peer reviewed by Society for Range Management accredited individuals. The Rangeland Health Indicators used in the analysis were co-authored by the BLM and the NRCS, and have undergone peer review. The Rangeland Health Standards evaluation process used in this analysis has undergone a Technical Team review by BLM and

	academic specialists. Permittees have been involved in data collection, and in proposing alternatives to resolve identified concerns.
<p>“Be it Further Resolved that if any management conflicts arise between Monument management personnel and the BLM area resource and grazing specialists, an expert third party arbiter acceptable to the permittees(s) and the BLM resolve differences in a timely manner.”</p>	<p>Inconsistent – The Proposed decision will receive ninety days of public comment. The subsequent Final decision is subject to appeal by interested parties, and the proposed plan amendment is subject to protest. “Conflicts” at any stage of this public decision-making process must be resolved consisted with Federal law, and the BLM appeal regulations at 43 CFR 4. Future implementation actions will be coordinated with the County to avoid “management conflicts”. Any and all third party information would be considered during future implementation actions.</p>
<p>“Be it Further Resolved that BLM management of the monument shall follow the Presidents Proclamation allowing reasonable and planned maintenance, improvement, restoration, and rehabilitation processes, while enhancing the land and its forage not only for its value for domestic livestock, but for wildlife and for protection and enhancement of the watershed.”</p>	<p>Consistent - All action alternatives in the draft EIS include restoration, and rehabilitation proposals to improve the vegetation resource, and thereby to improve the “value” for wildlife, livestock, and watershed protection. Proposed actions are based upon 43 CFR 4120.</p>
<p>“Be it Further Resolved that the BLM must coordinate its management of grazing on the Monument with the grazing policy provisions of the Garfield and Kane County General Plans before any action is taken. Differences or disputes regarding actions between the BLM and the County General Plan shall be mutually resolved before implementation of the federal action or plan.”</p>	<p>Inconsistent - To the maximum extent practicable, the draft MMP amendment has been coordinated with the Garfield and Kane County General Plans, and other applicable Federal, State and local plans. BLM will continue to work to resolve all “differences and disputes” with all interested parties.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Kane County General Plan Adopted June 22, 1998</p>	
<p><i>Vision Statement</i> “Federal land managers have recognized that to be most effective, federal land planning must include state and local governments as full partners in the public lands planning process.” “The Kane County Commission intends to become a proactive partner in all public lands planning processes which impact the county land base.” <i>“Federal land management planning processes will include Kane County as an active, on-going partner and will be consistent with county goals and policies when not constrained by federal law.”</i></p>	<p>Consistent – Kane County has been an active participant in the analysis, including membership on the interdisciplinary analysis team, and formal recognition as a collaborator in the planning process.</p>

<p><i>Environment Goals and Policies</i></p> <p>“Maintain or improve the primary landscape soil, vegetation and watershed resources in a manner that perpetuates and sustains a diversity of uses while fully supporting the custom, culture, economic stability and viability of Kane County and our individual citizens. Essentially all rangeland use and value is dependent upon maintenance and enhancement of the primary landscape soil and vegetation resource.”</p>	<p>Consistent – All actions proposed are intended to protect rangeland health while maintaining the sustainability of the livestock industry within the County.</p>
<p><i>“Strategies:</i></p> <p>1) Develop a systematic procedure to coordinate all BLM land use inventory, planning and management activities with Kane County...</p>	<p>Consistent</p>
<p>2) Develop and implement Allotment Management Plans (AMP’s)...</p>	<p>Consistent – The allotment specific actions in Appendix 1 meet the regulatory requirements for allotment management planning.</p>
<p>3) Review and adjust grazing stocking levels only in accordance with developed AMPs and/or trend monitoring data based on rangeland studies in accordance with trend monitoring...</p>	<p>Consistent – Stocking adjustments are proposed based upon trend, utilization, riparian functionality, and rangeland health indicators. No reductions are proposed which are inconsistent with trend, when used with other monitoring methods.</p>
<p>4) Assure that adjudicated grazing preference held by permittees is authorized according to the governing Federal statutes...</p>	<p>Consistent</p>
<p>6) Include within, fire line and site rehabilitation plans native or exotic vegetation capable of supporting watershed function and habitat for wildlife and livestock.</p>	<p>Consistent – the draft MMP amendment language specifies when native and non-native seeds can be used in restoration or rehabilitation, and continues the use of non-native seeds when necessary to protect watershed function, consistent with the needs of wildlife and livestock.</p>
<p>7) Develop grazing management plans following wild or prescribed fire...</p>	<p>Consistent – the draft MMP amendment provides direction for the management of livestock to protect vegetation and watershed resources after either a natural or introduced fire.</p>
<p>8) Develop and implement an aggressive juniper and shrub abatement and control plan for all sites where invasion is adversely affecting desirable vegetation and or wildlife.</p>	<p>Consistent – The modifications of existing MMP language concerning vegetation management are proposed to increase the effectiveness of rangeland restoration projects, including those which restore lands impacted by juniper and woody shrub encroachment.</p>
<p>9) Develop surface disturbance mitigation plans on soils with a high or very high erosion hazard rating within plans for multiple... mechanical range treatments, prescribed fires, range improvements and vegetation manipulation.</p>	<p>Consistent - The modifications of existing MMP language concerning vegetation management are proposed to protect soils from erosion, and target highly erosive soils. Mechanical treatments, introduced fire, range improvements, and seedings are proposed to correct identified concerns with erosion.</p>
<p>11) Apply State of Utah approved noxious weed control methods...”</p>	<p>Consistent – Required by law, and by BLM policy. Included in the Standard Operating Procedures.</p>

<p><i>Economic Development</i> (No mention of ranching in this portion of the County Plan, outside of historical discussion of the introduction of livestock and subsequent development of “overgrazing”.)</p>	<p>Consistent – The preferred alternative will further the economic stability of the County by ensuring the future sustainability of the livestock grazing industry.</p>
<p><i>Public Lands</i> <i>Goals and Policies (Range Management)</i> “Continue to insist that federal land management plans which regulate public lands in Kane County promote the multiple use/sustained yield concepts of public lands use.”</p>	<p>Consistent – All action alternatives are consistent with multiple use and sustained yield. Monitoring indicates that the “no action” alternative is not consistent with sustained yield, and multiple use conflicts were identified. The “cause for change” behind this proposed MMP amendment is to return livestock management to sustained yield while reducing multiple use conflicts.</p>
<p>“Work closely with federal land managers in the preparation of federal Resource Management Plans.”</p>	<p>Consistent – The County participate directly in all phases of the analysis process, including the formulation of alternatives and proposed MMP amendment language.</p>
<p>“All federal land management agencies in Kane County should include a full assessment of the social and economic impacts of management actions.”</p>	<p>Consistent – A full assessment of the economic impacts was included in the analysis, with contributions by the County, a third party academic contractor, and a subcommittee of the Monument Advisory Committee.</p>
<p>“Provide for landscape vegetation maintenance and improvement which will support restoration of suspended AUM’s, allocation of continuously available temporary non-renewable use as active preference, and will support continued use and or increased use of State school endowment trust lands.”</p>	<p>Consistent – All action alternatives provide for the improvement of vegetation. No allotments had “continuously available temporary non-renewable use”, and many were unable to use full preference.</p>
<p><i>Strategies: (Range Management)</i> “2) Implement rangeland improvement programs, including but not limited to; water developments, rangeland restoration, juniper/shrub control, and weed control to achieve forage and livestock grazing as well as other multiple use resource goals.</p>	<p>Consistent – Range improvements and vegetative treatments are proposed under all action alternatives</p>
<p>3) Identify and develop off-stream water sources... in all allotments pastures with sensitive riparian areas and in all allotments where improved livestock distribution will result...</p>	<p>Consistent – The protection of sensitive riparian areas is proposed in all action alternatives, to include the use of off-stream water sources, and improved livestock distribution.</p>
<p>4) Identify and implement all possible livestock distribution, forage production enhancement and weed control programs before seeking changes in livestock use levels.</p>	<p>Consistent – While “all possible” actions have not been assessed, all action alternatives include proposals which improve livestock distribution, vegetation restoration, and noxious/invasive species controls. Livestock stocking level adjustments are proposed where forage use levels indicate negative impacts, such as increased susceptibility to weeds.</p>
<p>5) Identify and initiate reductions in stocking levels, only when monitoring data demonstrates that</p>	<p>Consistent – Reductions and/or changes in grazing management are proposed when monitoring</p>

grazing management supported by range improvements and specialized grazing systems, are not supporting basic soils, vegetation and watershed goals.	indicates negative impacts of soils, vegetation, or watershed health. Proposed changes in grazing management include range improvements and revised grazing systems, including rest, and deferred rest rotations.
6) Assure that all grazing management actions and strategies fully consider... potential impacts of such actions on grazing animal production.”	Consistent – Economic impacts have been assessed and disclosed for all action alternatives.
7) Where monitoring history, actual use or authorizations of TNR demonstrates that supplemental use is continuously available, and can or should be used to improve or protect rangelands... initiate a process to allocate such use to permittees as active preference.”	Consistent – No incidents of “continuously available” forage as indicated by TNR authorizations, or actual use levels were found. Monitoring did not indicate the perpetual availability of excess forage.
<u><i>Goals and Policies: (Water Quality)</i></u> “Meet the requirements for water quality contained in the State of Utah water quality plan... to maintain or improve riparian areas and aquatic habitat that represents a range of variability for functioning condition.”	Consistent – Compliance with Utah water quality standards was assessed. All action alternative include measures to maintain or improve riparian and aquatic habitat.
<u><i>Goals and Policies: (Wildlife)</i></u> “Maintain, improve or mitigate habitat in order to sustain viable and harvestable populations of big game and upland game species as well as wetland/riparian habitat for... a diversity of other game and non-game species.”	Consistent – All action alternatives include actions design to improve or maintain wildlife habitat, and improve or maintain riparian habitat.
<u><i>Strategies: (Wildlife)</i></u> “3) Accelerate the planning, approval and completion of additional water developments, rangeland treatment projects and prescribed burns with objectives for enhancement of big game and other wildlife habitat.	Consistent – All action alternative include proposals to improve vegetation management, with intent to improve wildlife habitat in accordance with Utah DWR wildlife management goals.
<u><i>Actions: Cultural</i></u> 2) Where sufficient data indicates adverse impacts of multiple uses occurring on a site, establish mitigation measures to reduce impacts and protect and conserve unique cultural and paleontological resources.”	Consistent –The Cultural Resource Protocol (Appendix 3) establishes mitigation measures to protect cultural sites. No impacts to paleontological resources were disclosed during scoping for this analysis.
<u><i>Goals and Policies (Woodland Management)</i></u> “Maintain or improve conifer tree health, vegetation diversity, wildlife and watershed values through active management of conifer forests in Kane County and prevent encroachment of Pinyon-Juniper into these communities”	Consistent – The draft MMP amendment language increases vegetation management effectiveness, and proposes active management of woodlands and forests through rehabilitation and restoration.
<u><i>Actions: (Woodland Management)</i></u> “1) Plan and implement selective... firewood harvesting programs... to improve forest health.	Consistent – Draft MMP amendment language specifically addresses fuelwood harvesting, and maintains or improves the availability of fuelwood

	consistent with vegetation management goals.
2) Plan and implement reclamation of disturbed forest sites.	Consistent – Reclamation of disturbed vegetation, including forests, is included in the draft MMP amendment.
4) Plan and implement grazing management strategies designed to enhance conifer forest goals.”	Consistent – The impacts of grazing management on forest resources was assessed during the analysis process.
<u>Actions: (Recreation)</u> “6) Describe methods of minimizing or mitigating documented use conflicts or damage and define the manner in which each method is expected to accomplish minimization or mitigation.”	Consistent – Conflicts between livestock and recreation were identified on a site specific basis during the analysis, and actions are proposed in all action alternatives to reduce or remove the conflict. Proposed measures are provided in Appendix 1, on an allotment specific basis.